## REMARKS

The applicants have considered the Office action dated July 16, 2009, and the references it cites. By way of this response, claims 6, 13 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice to their further prosecution, and claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18 and 20 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18 and 20 are pending and at issue. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are fully supported by the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Examiner Interview Summary

The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in a telephonic Examiner interview conducted on October 13, 2009. The Examiner and the undersigned were the only participants in the call. The subject matter of the pending claims and the references cited in the Office action were discussed. The amendments to the independent claims discussed during the interview are reflected in this written submission. Although no agreement was reached during the interview, it is respectfully submitted that the claims presented herein are allowable over the art relied upon by the Office action.

### Claim Objections

The Office action objected to claims 1, 4-5, 9 and 16 for failing to define the acronyms DHCP, DNS, MAC and HTTP. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 12, 16 and 18 have been amended to define these and other acronyms. Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

**Art Rejections: Claim 1**

The Office action rejected independent claim 1 as being unpatentable over *Lee* (U.S. 6,958,992) in view of *Watson* (U.S. 7,009,984) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Independent claim 1 recites an Internet Protocol (IP) phone comprising an IP agent to monitor for changes to a public IP address associated with a firewall after the IP phone is registered with a DNS switch and, upon detecting a change to the public IP address associated with the firewall, the IP agent is to identify a new public IP address associated with the firewall and reregister with the DNS switch without reinitializing the IP phone.

Although *Lee* and *Watson* both describe IP phone registration, amended independent claim 1 is patentable because neither *Lee* nor *Watson*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests (a) monitoring for changes to a public IP address associated with a firewall after the IP phone is already registered with a DNS switch, or (b) reregistering with the DNS switch without reinitializing the IP phone upon detecting a change to the public IP address associated with the firewall. Instead, *Lee's* IP phone registration processes are limited to performing registration with an IP phone switch during initialization and booting-up of the IP phone. (See *Lee*, 3:13-19, 4:8-12, 4:34-36, 5:5-8.) For example, even if the IP phone has been previously registered with the IP phone switch, *Lee's* registration process still requires the IP phone to be initialized and booted-up to register with the IP phone switch again. (*Id.* at 4:8-12.) Similarly, *Watson's* registration process is also directed to initialization of the IP phone. For example, *Watson* describes that its registration process is performed upon the phone station being "plugged into a particular network" and "as part of [the phone station's] configuration." (See *Watson*, 8:31-50.)

Because IP phone registration as described in both *Lee* and *Watson* is limited to registration during initialization/configuration or booting-up of the IP phone, *Lee* and *Watson*, as

well as their combination, fail to teach or suggest registration involving subsequent <u>monitoring</u> for changes to a public IP address associated with a firewall <u>after the IP phone is already registered with a DNS switch</u>. Furthermore, because their registration procedures all involve initialization/configuration or booting-up of the IP phone, *Lee* and *Watson*, as well as their combination, also fail to teach or suggest any procedure involving <u>reregistering</u> with the DNS switch <u>without reinitializing the IP phone</u> upon detecting a change to the public IP address associated with the firewall. For at least these reasons, amended claim 1 is patentable over the art relied upon by the Office action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Art Rejections: Claim 9**

The Office action rejected independent claim 9 as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Watson* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent claim 9, as amended, recites a method comprising registering a first IP phone, wherein the first IP phone is to monitor for changes in a public IP address associated with a first firewall after the first IP phone is registered and, upon detecting a new public IP address associated with the first firewall, the first IP phone is to reregister without reinitializing the first IP phone.

Neither *Lee* nor *Watson*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests (a) monitoring for changes in a public IP address associated with a first firewall <u>after a first IP phone is already registered</u>, or (b) <u>reregistering</u> the first IP phone <u>without reinitializing the first IP phone</u> upon detecting a new public IP address associated with the first firewall. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claim 9 and all claims depending therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Art Rejections: Claim 16**

The Office action rejected independent claim 16 as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Watson* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent claim 16, as amended, recites an article of manufacture comprising a tangible medium having computer readable code embodied therein which, when executed, causes a machine to, among other things, monitor for changes to a public IP address associated with a firewall after successful registration of an IP phone with a DNS switch, and upon detecting a new public IP address of the firewall, reregister with the DNS switch without reinitializing the IP phone.

Neither *Lee* nor *Watson*, nor their combination, teaches or suggests causing a machine to (a) monitor for changes to a public IP address associated with a firewall after successful registration of an IP phone with a DNS switch, or (b) reregister with the DNS switch without reinitializing the IP phone upon detecting a new public IP address of the firewall. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claim 16 and all claims depending therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Further Remarks**

Claims 9 and 11 have been amended to remove "step" language to make it clear that such claims should not be construed under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶6.

In general, the Office action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

If the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or any additional fees which may be required during the pendency of this application under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 or under other applicable rules (except payment of issue fees) to Deposit Account No. 50-2455. Please direct all correspondence to the address associated with USPTO Customer Number 83417.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   /William E. Jacklin/
William E. Jacklin
Registration No. 64,894
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(312) 580-1020
November 11, 2009      **HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC**